

which were used to good American clothes and were used to living a lot like Americans—they were pretty Westernized and didn't like the Reds at all—or there were people in there who had come from foreign countries.

"Some were Chinese Nationalists with foreign dependents, wives, from Japan, Vietnam, and even a few from the United States. They had other foreigners there, plus us, and we got along fairly well. In fact, the whole group of people in this factory were mainly people who really opposed the regime in some way or other, except for about 1 percent, who were the Communist leaders—the cadre—at this place.

"Question. What did the workers say about the regime?

"Answer. They spoke very frankly about it. Some of the things they didn't like: They didn't have enough freedom; they couldn't go home; they couldn't work where they wanted to, and they couldn't do what they wanted to. They didn't like the food.

"And they refused to study—they hated the course in indoctrination—and some of them would hit their head and they would say it gave them a headache to study—might drive them crazy.

"SURROUNDED BY POLICE"

"Question. Was the discipline pretty strict at the factory?

"Answer. Where we lived, in a dormitory, we were in a little compound surrounded by the industrial-police compound, and it was not much better than the farm.

"Question. Did you see lots of police?

"Answer. The police were everywhere. They were constantly on patrol. They guarded theaters, stores, factories—they were all over the place.

"Question. You had already decided to try to get out of China before they sent you to this factory. What made you want to leave?

"Answer. The main thing was the discovery that the Communist system, as practiced in China, was in reality not a truly Socialist state, or a "people's state," as they referred to it. It was strictly a slave state. I suppose the main thing is that I started to believe in individualism and the right of privacy of the human being—and that's something which just cannot exist in that type of society.

"Question. The individual has no privacy over there?

"Answer. That's exactly what I mean. Actually, the people never know who to trust—children, mothers, fathers, husbands—you never know who is actually a spy for the state, and it gets down to where a person never expresses his own thought, even to his own family. He doesn't even trust his own family. And when a person can't even trust his own father or his own mother, then it's really getting pretty bad. It's certainly not a very decent place to have to live in.

"Question. Individualism—you mentioned that. Do you mean you can't have a life of your own under communism?

"Answer. I just wanted to do the little things in life, like having a job, going to school, having a family—that's something that's just practically out of your reach there. You were supposed to develop your ideology toward their way, but the things which were really necessary for a person's happiness, you just didn't have.

"For example, the idea of settling down and having your own home, your own family, going to school, working on a job that you're interested in, having your own hobbies, going on vacation like a person looks forward to in the United States—things of this nature you just can't look forward to there.

"All you've got is what they place before you—it's the life of the masses, they call it."

Is It Un-Christian To Believe in Segregation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1957

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, Walter B. Jones, presiding judge, 15th Judicial Circuit of Alabama, recently delivered an address, "Is It Un-Christian To Believe in Segregation?" before the Baptist Laymen of Alabama.

Judge Jones' father was a gallant soldier, a distinguished Governor of Alabama and an outstanding Federal Judge.

Judge Jones is a deep student of the Bible and is one who for many years has taken an active interest in the religious, social, civic, and business life of Montgomery. He is the president of the Alabama Bible Society, Jones Law School, past national archon—president—of the SAE Fraternity, an author of lawbooks, writer, and has had many honors—too numerous to mention—bestowed upon him. It can, therefore, be said that he knows whereof he speaks.

IS IT UN-CHRISTIAN TO BELIEVE IN SEGREGATION?

(Remarks of Walter B. Jones, presiding judge, 15th Judicial Circuit of Alabama, before the Baptist Laymen of Alabama, at Montgomery, July 11, 1957)

It is a distinguished privilege to be here this evening and to speak before you, the Baptist Laymen of Alabama, your friends and guests.

You stand unflinchingly for the ancient principles of separation of church and state, segregated schools and churches, local self-government and of race. You are doing a man's part in preserving for your people the true teachings of the Bible and to keep pure the blood of the white race.

You seek to promote the active participation in the affairs of your churches of all good men, and you repudiate and reject all philosophical and sociological rules laid down by modern, so-called prophets, of whom the Prophet Earl is the archetype.

It is good for our State and her people that you Baptist Laymen of Alabama have organized for action. Plato, the Greek philosopher, said many years ago:

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

You realize the truth of the statement and you are doing something to block the forces of evil and discord in religion.

The times and conditions in which we live make it necessary that all church people, who insist upon their rights to worship their God according to the dictates of their conscience, must organize. We must wage, at all times, the Christian and honorable struggle for religious freedom. Liberty-loving Americans must stand up for the rights of their churches. We must speak the truth and "if an offense comes out of the truth," wrote St. Jerome, "it is better that the offense come than that the truth be concealed."

SEGREGATION DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH TEACHINGS OF CHRIST

In all the discussion today about integrating the white and Negro races in the public schools, in all public recreation facilities, and in the churches, we hear it con-

stantly said, day in and day out, by vast numbers of deceived and misguided people, that it is unchristian to believe in the ancient and time-honored doctrine of separation of the races, that segregation is in conflict with the spirit and teachings of Christ and the Apostles.

It is dinned into our ears that those who conscientiously oppose integration in our churches are acting contrary to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and lack Christian sympathy and Christian idealism.

It is always safe to follow the dictates of one's conscience, and conscience is a knowledge or feeling of right and wrong, with a compulsion to do right. Conscience has been defined by Browning as:

"The great beacon light God sets in all, The conscience of each bosom."

And, of course, the very first step to having a religion is that there must be liberty of conscience.

Others, who have never experienced life in communities where a large part of the population is of the Negro race, tell us that, "integration is the Christian way," and that the believers in segregation are identifying themselves with the forces of iniquity. We are asked to believe that, "the segregation pattern is out of harmony with the spirit and teaching of the Bible."

The World Council of Churches says segregation is, "abhorrent to God"; that "segregation is essentially and necessarily a sin."

It is regrettable, too, that many of our great Protestant denominations are using as reference material in their church schools pamphlets of the United Nations which are frequently void of Christ and his teachings, and some of our denominations are using pamphlets and material of the National Council of Churches, which have been condemned as being "frequently socialistic and political."

NAME CALLING

Whenever name calling is resorted to, this is an unfailing sign that the ideas of the name callers are without merit—that their reasoning won't stand examination and analysis.

Washington, the Father of our Country, was called a rebel; Jefferson and Tom Paine were called atheists; Lee and Jackson were called traitors; people who lived in the North and sympathized with the Confederate States when the South was fighting for its independence, and did not cheer Lincoln's invasion and subjugation of the South, were called copperheads; and back in the eighties those who bolted the Republican Party because they believed in independence in political thought were called mugwumps.

And so today, those who have suddenly become disciples of the prophet Earl the First, realizing how untenable their position is, seek to terrify and frighten true Christians from their conscientious convictions by branding them as un-Christian, that is, lacking in the Christian spirit.

According to the base standards of these self-righteous critics, a person may love justice, do mercy, walk humbly before his God, and follow the teachings of the Master; and, yet, because the beacon light God set in his bosom, all the teachings of history, all the experiences of mankind, will not permit him to believe in integration, he is denounced as un-Christian by people who would lead their race, and their Nation, to destruction.

Their touchstone disregards all of Christianity's teachings: you are Christian or un-Christian as you accept or reject integration.

UNKIND CONDEMNATION

Others who pretend to believe that the Negro race is the equal in all respects, if not the superior, of the white race, tell us

that Christians and church groups who believe in segregation, stand condemned because of their honestly held beliefs.

It will come as no surprise to you to learn that the National Council of Churches and its predecessors, the Federal Council of Churches, have for many years made racial integration in the churches of our Nation, one of its main objectives, and it is a deep regret to know that nearly every religious denomination in the United States, some in a small degree, and yet others in a larger degree, are using their central organization to work for integration. Many of our religious denominations, the NAACP, and it has the financial and moral backing of the American Jewish Congress in New York, committees of labor unions, and the Supreme Court of the United States, and both of the Nation's chief political parties, are all working together to achieve complete integration of the races, and this we know is the first step toward amalgamation, the consolidating and fusing into 1 race the 2, the white and black races.

One of the world's best known evangelists, Billy Graham, now conducting a revival in New York City, recently said that "He believes the church in the South 'should lead the way toward bettering racial relationships' and that ministers should take a 'very firm stand in teaching their people along these lines.'"

"Graham said he tries in his own evangelistic 'crusades' to 'set an example' and permits no racial segregation at such meetings."

In Minneapolis, May 1956, the Methodist Church condemned racial segregation by any method or practice. At Kansas City, May 1956, it was noted that the Southern Baptist Convention had 2 years before expressed its approval of the Supreme Court's decision banning segregation in public schools. In May 1956 the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States adopted a report calling for "total elimination" of racial segregation in the United States. In July 1955 one of the Presbyterian synods voted 283 to 151 in favor of desegregation in all its schools and churches.

It is almost unbelievable, yet it is true, that the Presbyterian Church in one of our Southern States, underwrote the race-mixing activities of the Communist-dominated NAACP, and advanced \$10,000 in cash to "relieve pressing obligations" of the NAACP.

In May 1956 the delegates to the annual convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in North Carolina, voted overwhelmingly in favor of gradual integration in the churches; and an executive council report, urged the Episcopalians of North Carolina to abolish segregation in all public schools and to work diligently "in an effort to effect an orderly transition toward an integrated public-school system in the diocese of North Carolina."

The Fund for the Republic, an organization which often follows the Communist line and is being investigated by a congressional committee, recently made a grant of \$50,000 to the legal defense and educational fund of the NAACP.

It has organized a committee of social scientists to educate the Negroes as to their equal rights. This same Fund for the Republic also granted the Christian life commission of the Southern Baptist Convention \$15,000 to support interracial programs to ease racial tensions, in the North and South.

CONSCIENCE CANNOT BE FORCED

The church should remember that conscience cannot be forced even by fat grants of money from the Fund for the Republic.

It is more than passing strange that this new liberal doctrine of integrating the white and black races in all the churches never reared its ugly head until recent years, and then not until the black Monday (1954)

decision of the Supreme Court of the United States at Washington, a Court headed, as Vice President Nixon called him, "a great Republican Chief Justice." The Vice President didn't say headed by a great judge. The rest of the Court dominated by Mr. Warren owe their appointment and office first of all to political considerations.

Not since reconstruction days when the Supreme Court cringed before the clamor of the mob have the people had less confidence in its judges and rulings than they have today.

In days now "gone with the wind," Americans could depend on the judgments of the Supreme Court when its decisions were generally based on settled constructions of the Constitution and followed known legal precedents.

Where, during the past century, were those who are now so anxious for the integration of the races? Why, all these years, did their convictions trouble them so little? Is it possible that only the Prophet Earl could summon them to repentance?

If it is today regarded by many so highly unchristian to believe in the separation of the races, why wasn't it so generations and generations ago? Times and conditions change, but great fundamental principles are the same today as they were years ago.

IMPERISHABLE NAMES

Look back over the list of the justices who have sat on the United States Supreme Court. You find illustrious names like James Wilson, John Rutledge, John Marshall, Joseph Story, Roger B. Taney, Stephen J. Field, Horace Gray, Melville W. Fuller, David J. Brewer, Oliver W. Holmes, Charles E. Hughes, and William H. Taft. Many of the justices named served terms ranging from 10 to 30 years. They were not only wise jurists, but they were men who cherished the American way of life and revered the principles of our Constitution. Did any one of them ever suggest that it was un-Christian to believe, for the good of both races, and in the interest of law and order, that the separation of the races was un-Christian and should be done away with?

Recall the men who have served as Presidents of the United States, and who have left imperishable memories, do you find any word from them stigmatizing believers of segregation as un-Christian? Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson—did any of these great American statesmen condemn the millions and millions of their own race in America, who, in their day and time, believed in the wisdom of the separation of the races?

BIBLE PROOF FOR SEGREGATION

So, now, let us reason together and see if we who believe in the time-hallowed separation of the races, in our schools and in our churches, and who stand firm for our conscientious beliefs, are doing things that are unworthy of a Christian and abhorrent to God.

Let us go back to fundamentals. A Christian is one who bases his life on the teachings of Jesus Christ; and Christianity is a religion which adopts the doctrines taught by Christ. So let us turn now to the fountainhead, to Jesus Christ, to study His teachings and see if the separation of the races is un-Christian or was ever condemned by Him during His ministry here on earth.

Dr. J. E. Flow, of Concord, N. C., in a recent sermon, answered the question: Is segregation un-Christian? by stating that he believes in segregation for three reasons:

1. It is in harmony with the plan and purpose of God as the best means to prevent the amalgamation of the races;

2. It is in harmony with a well-known law of nature, stated in the proverb, "Birds of a feather will flock together." Sparrows will

not flock with robins, nor crows with quail; and

3. Because experience has shown that race segregation contributes to harmony and peace among the races.

These words from Dr. Flow are worthy of keeping before us:

"Segregation was decreed by God Himself in one historical instance. God called Abram out of Ur of Chaldees, to go into the land which he should afterward receive as an inheritance. The patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, lived in that land for many years. Jacob's clan, because of famine, went down into Egypt, and were settled in the land of Goshen, where they remained 400 years. Then God sent Moses to lead the tribes of Israel out of Egypt into the wilderness for 40 years, and Joshua led them into the land of Canaan, where the various tribes were settled. For 1,500 years till the birth of Christ they were a segregated nation. They were forbidden by God to mingle socially, to intermarry or to amalgamate with the nations around them. They did not always obey God, but nevertheless God commanded it, and many times punished them when they disobeyed His command. If allowed to mingle socially with each other the inevitable result would be amalgamation either with or without marriage. Then he notes:

"Out of that segregated nation, through inspired prophets from time to time, from Moses to Malachi, came the revealed will of God in the Old Testament. Out of that segregated nation came the Saviour of the world, and the New Testament which tells us of Him. Does anyone dare to say that God made a mistake in segregating the Jewish nation? Does anyone dare to say that segregation is wrong and un-Christian when the Almighty Himself did it?"

NO APEASEMENT TO ATHEISTIC COMMUNISM

Recently, the Right Reverend Albert S. Thomas, retired bishop of South Carolina, wrote an article on Development or Obliteration, in which he expressed the view that many integrationists seemed to have the motive of appeasing atheistic communism abroad, and this, wrote the bishop, seems more important to them than the happiness and well-being of a large portion of our own land which would be made secure by the ancient and accepted principle of the separation of the races. The bishop, continuing further, said: "There is virtue, rather than sin, in the maintenance of the integrity of every race as it has come to be in the providence of God. Do we not read in Acts (17: 26, RSV) that God 'has made from one every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their habitation?' These words seem clearly to indicate a divine purpose for every race. The plain implication is a racial separation, not inconsistent with love, but rather the appointment of God. It is a wonderful thought in keeping with divine revelation that in the increasing purpose of God through the ages there is a part to be played by each separate race, through the maintenance of its own integrity, especially with its accomplished self-realization. The unity of all men in the Body of Christ, their personal equal value in the sight of God, is not denied by such a conception, but rather assumed."

Frequently, you hear a lot of clap-trap and expressions from some of the Negro preachers, designed to gain applause, that, "I don't want to be your brother-in-law: I want to be your brother." Of course, all Christians are brothers in Christ and in Him there is no east nor west. But there is no principle of Christian brotherhood which implies any sort of equality, over and beyond this; and, surely there is none which gives a person a "preemptive right" of intrusion where his

presence is not wanted. It is unreasonable that the concept of brotherhood should be used to describe a condition of worldly equality.

WHAT IS BROTHERHOOD?

Dr. C. K. Brown of Davidson College, in a very interesting address, *The White South is a Minority Group*, tells us that:

"Brothers are not equal and cannot be; brotherhood is status in a family. There are big brother and little brother, each with duties of his own and responsibility to the other. Nowhere in the New Testament can I find that it is the purpose of Christianity to wipe out the differences that exist among men. It deals not with the many points in which they differ, but with the one point in which they are all alike. Some men have black skins, but all have black hearts. In dealing with this common characteristic, Christianity does not destroy the differences of men. It does something grander than that; it makes those differences irrelevant. If Jesus had intended to endorse the struggles of men for worldly position and prerogative. He could never have said that the meek shall inherit the earth. And if all the differences were to be wiped out, little room would be left for the charity enjoined by the rich 13th chapter of First Corinthians."

We Christians, who stand unawed by the insulting epithet of "un-Christian" and remain firm for the principle of segregation, find support in the Bible, Acts 17: 26, which reads:

"And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;"

The words, "hath made" mean that the Lord was acting in a sovereign will, power, wisdom, and disposal in setting the bounds of the habitation of the different races.

The word "nations," if you remember your Greek, comes from an ancient word "ethnos," meaning a multitude, whether of men or beasts, associated or living together of the same nature or genus, and this latter word "genus" means: "A category of classification between family and species, a group of structurally related species or an isolated species exhibiting unusual differentiation."

The writer of Acts, in using the word "nation," refers to the different races of the world, and not to the geographical boundaries of certain empires, nations, or republics.

The misguided integrationists, the people who want to destroy God's work in making and setting apart the great races of mankind, who want only one blood on the earth and that a mixture and amalgamation of white, black, and yellow, argue that their main support for integration of the races is the Golden Rule ("as you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them"). In the light of the verse I have just discussed from Acts, the race-mixtures have nothing upon which to stand. In the Golden Rule, Jesus was upholding the fair and just treatment of our fellow human beings. He was not thinking of the integration of the races, of destroying the work of His Father.

This new religion, which was revealed to us on black Monday, by Prophet Earl Warren, is gradually destroying many of our churches. Many Christians are leaving the integrationist churches and are staying at home.

A RELIGIOUS FRAUD

Prof. W. C. George, a native North Carolinian, connected with the School of Medicine at Chapel Hill, made a telling point in a recent address made at Dartmouth College, "Human Progress and the Race Problem." In this address he said:

"It is asserted that integration is the Christian way and that separation of the races is un-Christian. It is not clear why

anything should be accepted as Christian when its virtue has not been demonstrated. Strange connotations have been given to words nowadays. I believe you will join me in saying that it is a religious fraud to claim that Christianity would require us to adopt a public policy that would lead to destruction of our race."

Later on in this splendid address, made in the heart of the integration country, Professor George tells us that many strange and evil things have been advocated in the name of religion. He recalls that there was a time when Abraham thought that his religion required him to sacrifice his son, Isaac, as a burnt offering to God. So today, the integrationists are telling us to sacrifice our children on the altar of integration.

When people ask you: Is it necessary for a Christian to support integration? You can answer with all confidence: No.

Is it our Christian duty to preserve the integrity of our race and the purity of its blood strain as God Almighty created it? If we do not, we will become a hybrid race, and that, of course, is an inferior race.

WHY GOD CREATED THE RACES OF MANKIND

The Reverend James P. Dees, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, Statesville, N. C., recently asked this question and answered it:

"How can this be the will of God or of Christ? or even the natural product of natural processes or natural law? Even if there were no intermarriage—though I am convinced that that is what is intended—it is contrary to and violates principles intrinsic to the created order and to apparent universal moral law. Races, I believe, were created by God to witness to Him as races, as well as individuals were created to witness as individuals. Every race, I believe, should have something to contribute to the eternal plan."

Mr. Dees stated that his view that integration is contrary to the moral law, finds support in commonsense as you look around you. He says:

"Do blackbirds intermingle with the bluebirds? Does the redwing fly with the crows? Would it make sense for my senior warden to mix Black Angus cattle with his purebred Herefords? Commonsense, knotty-headed commonsense, cries out against it, 'No.' It is abhorrent to the natural created order. * * * I cannot conform my intellectual integrity to any other position than that the integration of the races is contrary to natural law, which natural law, even though corrupted, is the product of the hand of God."

PRESERVING RACIAL INTEGRITY

The North Carolina clergyman notes, as I stated at the beginning of this talk, that those of us who, true to the dictates of our conscience, believe in segregation are branded un-Christian and anti-Christian. He denies this false charge and says:

"I believe, to the contrary, that this position is more in harmony with the ultimate Christian position in this particular situation, than is the position of those who are pushing the contrary position, and certainly more in accord with natural law. * * * It is argued, and rightly so, that segregation discriminates against the Negro race in many areas. Where this is so, the answer is not unification, but rather a bettering of the discriminating situation. As one southern governor has stated: 'When schools are unequal, the remedy is not to destroy the schools or the law. The remedy is to require that the schools be made equal.' And with this I heartily concur. As the retired bishop of South Carolina, Rt. Rev. Albert S. Thomas has said: 'Where segregation is un-Christian, this is due to man's fallen nature, not to segregation itself.' The supreme command is 'Love thy neighbor.' I recognize my neighbor in the Negro. Carrying out this command implies helping him to attain to

the fullest stature possible as a child of God, both as an individual and as a race. I am compelled to conclude that he can come to his fullest development when his racial integrity is preserved. The destruction of his racial integrity seems to me to be contrary to the natural primal creation of God and to natural law and to enlightened commonsense."

In the name of conscience, what is it that makes it so un-Christian, in the United States above all lands, where we stand for freedom of association and against association forced by law, for a person to sincerely desire to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, among his own people, among the people of his own race and moral standards?

Always remember that God created us as free agents and our right to select our associates is of vital importance to our happiness. No government and no court has the right to demand of us what people we must associate with and make our companions. This principle holds good in all conditions of life, especially in our social and religious relations.

I cannot find anything unchristian in a group of loyal American people, sincere followers of Christ, building through their own efforts and sacrifices, and with their own money, a church where they may worship God—a temple into which their money and sacrifices are built and a church which no other race has contributed 1 cent to its building, and nothing whatever to its maintenance and desiring to worship there without intrusion.

THE RIGHT TO WORSHIP WITHOUT INTRUSION

Is it un-Christian for members of the white race, created by God himself, and who have always aided the Negro race, to better itself, to wish to remain members of the white race and to preserve the race as God created it? What is wrong with those whose conscience, and conscience, remember is the voice of God, tells them that their high moral duty is to preserve the integrity of the white race, wishing to worship God in temples built by their own hands, in their own way, according to their conscientious convictions and wishing to follow countless centuries of custom and practice.

HOLDS FAST TO GOD-GIVEN CONVICTIONS

And now, my friends, may we who believe in the Constitution of the United States as so soundly construed by upright and patriotic judges of wiser and happier times; we who worship God according to the dictates of our conscience; we who believe it to be a sacred duty to preserve the integrity of our race as God created it, and we who love our churches and who do not wish them disrupted, our church people torn and divided by dissension and discord—may we hold fast to our God given convictions, cling with fortitude to our beliefs and the ancient beliefs of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, and having taken our stand, may we be "steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that our labor is not in vain in the Lord."

INTEGRATION IS NOT INEVITABLE

Do not be deceived by all the talk that integration is inevitable; that it is bound to happen; that do what we may against it, integration is certain to come. Do not accept this defeatist attitude, do not swallow this deadly opiate.

Have faith in the commonsense of our people and in the final triumph of our right to worship God according to the command of our conscience. Let us pray that it is our God's will that this struggle for freedom of conscience and liberty of association will be won. Let us stand steadfast, yield not 1 inch, not be terrified and beaten back by the sinister forces of evil now rampant throughout the land, if we will do these things, then the victory will be ours:

"Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world of strife,
And know that out of death and night shall
Rise the dawn of ampler life:
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend the heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times and have your
Part in Freedom's crowning hour,
That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to
take—
I saw the powers of darkness take their flight;
I saw the morning break."

**Washington Report by Congressman
Bruce Alger**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1957

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter of July 20:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

July 20, 1957.

The Veterans Beneficiaries Act (amending World War Veterans Act, 1924) (H. R. 72, is remembered by some of us as an example of the frequent "painful responsibility" versus "political demagogic" legislative choice in the job of being a Congressman. This act is a credit to the Veterans' Affairs Committee since their majority vote brought before the House this bill to get approximately \$200,000 back to the Federal Treasury. The bill provided that Federal payments of gratuities to guardians of veterans who have legal disability (mental incompetence) shall revert to the United States Treasury if the veteran dies leaving no spouse, child or dependent parent. Gratuities are defined as: (1) Compensation for service-connected disability or death; (2) pension for non-service-connected disability or death; (3) emergency officers retirement pay; (4) serviceman's indemnity; and (5) retirement pay—these are distinguished from United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance. Further, the money would revert only after payment of debts and satisfaction to all creditors including expense of death and administering the estate. It was never the intent of Congress that veterans' benefits should be accumulated for the enrichment of uncles, aunts, nieces, nephews, cousins, and other distant relatives who had little, if any, to do with the veteran. By intention, no provision of the bill would have affected any veteran adversely. Could we pass this eminently responsible piece of legislation? No; it was defeated 191-161 and left some Members with a feeling of "what's the use of being fiscally responsible anyway." Here's another example of legislation which would become law if the people know the facts and kept the pressure for economy on Senators and Representatives. It also is additional proof that, except for political speeches, the "cut the budget" effort in Congress is almost forgotten. The people, if enough were vocal, could change this by demanding economy—but won't. And so we drift on into bigger Government expenditure and control.

The Mutual Security Act of 1954 amendment, known as foreign-aid authorization for 1958, came to us as a bill of 33 pages, accompanied by a 108-page report, based on 7 volumes of hearings, explaining the need for \$3.242 billion financial aid to 59 countries.

Ten countries get military assistance, 28 get military and economic aid, 21 get economic aid only. This continues the program under which, between 1945 and 1956, \$69 billion have been given away (an amount equivalent to all real and personal property of our 17 largest cities, including Dallas). Argument for: To keep peace through military strengthening of our allies and through helping backward areas develop economically. Has it succeeded? There's the debate. Some say the proof is that "we are not fighting" and "communism's spread has been decelerated." Hence, it is successful. This is a powerful argument, not to be dismissed lightly. Others hold the program is self-defeating, wasteful, mismanaged, even unconstitutional.

As for me, I have opposed foreign aid repeatedly and have clearly stated why, for any and all to hear. In this and every legislative matter, an open mind is a must. Facts and principles, not blind prejudice, should hold. I have tried to be objective, but some criticisms of the program are so damaging that my opposition has been strengthened. They include: (1) Congress (the taxpayers' representatives) is now asked to surrender control in blankcheck fashion, (henceforth the military will control all defense expenses, the executive the revolving loan program); (2) too much money—there is now \$6.2 billion appropriated but unspent, plus \$2 billion of agricultural surplus gifts (Newsletter, June 22) and now \$3.2 billion which totals \$11.4 billion (plus \$1.275 billion for 1959 and 1960); (3) better correlation and efficient planning of various programs is needed (military, economic, food disposal, etc.); (4) the national debt may be increased by the new loan fund, particularly dangerous since no loan plan has been developed and presented; (5) six nations have paid down their public debt with United States money.

Basically, we have failed to convey American belief and ideals because of contradictions and inconsistencies. We are a paradox to others, defeating our purpose "to win friends and influence." We attempt by dollars, strict materialism, to help others, contradicting our own historical development, a Christian society which succeeded because of individual effort based on private enterprise, individual freedom under a Declaration of Independence which guaranteed nothing but the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Now we try to support and secure for others a higher standard of living which can happen, not by our gifts, but only if and when others want to work for it, as did and do United States citizens. Indeed, we are supporting communism (Yugoslavia) and socialism (in India, Italy, France, and even England), ideologies denying people the freedom from which resulted the United States wealth. We are subsidizing alien philosophies at a time when the world is locked in a deadly struggle testing which philosophy will win.

**Court's Backing of Girard Deal Sets an
Ugly Precedent**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1957

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 12, 1957, there appeared in the Nashville Tennessean an editorial concerning the unanimous decision handed

down by the Supreme Court in the Girard case.

As the editorial points out, the opening of this Pandora's box may well lead to the GI becoming a pawn to be sacrificed at will in the game of international politics and diplomacy.

The editorial follows:

**COURT'S BACKING OF GIRARD DEAL SETS AN
UGLY PRECEDENT**

The Constitution does not follow the American soldier overseas, according to a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in the Girard case, and the Eisenhower administration is said to be happy over the news.

Boiled down to its essentials, the Status of Forces Agreement between Japan and the United States left the way open, in the Court's view, for our country to give up its primary jurisdiction and waive its rights when this was of particular importance to the other nation involved.

The GI therefore becomes a pawn to be sacrificed at will in the game of international politics and diplomacy.

This is true, not only in Japan, we learn, but in other countries.

Like Judge Joseph McGarraghy of the Federal district court, the Supreme Court concedes that Sp3c. William S. Girard was on official duty at the time of a Japanese woman's untimely death at Camp Weir range in Japan. In firing an empty cartridge case from a hand grenade launcher the GI was guilty of reckless and stupid behavior which unquestionably deserved punishment.

But whereas Judge McGarraghy held that jurisdiction lay with the American military command by reason of the Constitution, and that this was something that could not be bartered away, the highest court abruptly declares "delivery of Girard is not prohibited by the Constitution," and "in the absence of such a ban, the judgment of the executive department should be upheld."

There is nothing in the opinion to indicate that if the executive department had refused to deliver Girard to Japan, and the case had been brought on this issue, the court would not just as readily have ruled that the administration was right for constitutional reasons.

There are, of course, certain spheres of activity beyond the line of duty in which soldiers overseas should be subject to the laws of guest nations. This has traditionally been the case. But there are shocking implications that duty, however wrongly carried out, does not prevent the deprivation of hitherto accepted rights when some other nation claims it is of particular importance.

This, we think, is playing fast and loose with the rights of American boys who go overseas as defenders of democracy.

Carrying weight with the Supreme Court, it is clear, was the stand of the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armies, in company with his Secretary of State, that Girard must be tried in a Japanese court in furtherance of national security.

We are in this case appeasing Japan, but at the same time we are opening a Pandora's box of troubles.

For who can doubt that the pattern set by the administration will be marked down by Communists and leftist troublemakers in all countries where our troops are quartered? Instead of less incidents of this kind, more can be expected.

The fate of GI Girard, who long since should have been firmly dealt with by court-martial, now bids fair to become symbolic of what to expect from the United States Government if enough furore can be raised through riots and threats.

Walter B. Jones, Judge 15th Judicial Circuit of Alabama,

"Is it Un-Christian to Believe in Segregation"

entered into the Congressional Record by Representative George M. Grant, AL,
85th Cong. Sess.1, July 22, 1957: A5888-A5891.